

Vote Indiana Team Meeting
July 18, 2003
Indiana Government Center South, Conference Room 4-5
Indianapolis, Indiana
Draft Meeting Notes

Todd Rokita, Secretary of State
Christa Adkins, Indiana Libertarian Party
Tami Barreto, League of Women Voters
Claudia Cummings (for Regina Moore), IVRA
Dick Dodge, Steuben County Commissioner
Dax Denton (for Dick Dodge), Association of Indiana Counties
Pam Finalyson, Allen County Election Administrator
Linda Grass, Hancock County Clerk
Ruth Hibbard (for Linda Grass) President of Clerk's Association, Clinton County Clerk
Dee Ann Hart, Disability Community Representative
Laura Herzog, Hendricks County Election Supervisor, IVRA representative
Nan Nidlinger, Adams County Clerk (for Laura Herzog)
Suellen Jackson-Boner, Governor's Planning Council for People with Disabilities
Mike Kiefer, Military Representative
Brad King, Indiana Election Division
Zach Main, Indiana State Republican Party
Martha Padish, Vermillion County Clerk
Nick Rhoad, Disability Community Representative
Kathy Richardson, State Representative
Kristi Robertson, Indiana Election Division (for Jon Laramore in his absence & Robin Winston upon his departure)
Joe Ryan, Military Representative
Robert Vane (for Doris Anne Sadler), Marion County Election Board Administrator
Patricia Wilson, Hispanic Community Representative
Robin Winston, Indiana State Democratic Party
Facilitators: Sarah Taylor, Anita Kolkmeier, and Holly Davis

Others present were the following:

Julia Vaughn, Count Us In
Julie Booth, Accenture
Angie Neeb, Rush County Election Board Office
Don Kooks, ACBI
Lesa Dietrick, Ice Miller
Jane Fischer, Manatron
Cheryl Kennard, Quest
Tammy Taylor, EDS
Joe Money, National Federation of the Blind of Indiana, Legislative Chair
Susan Jones, National Federation of the Blind
Ann Jochim, Spencer County Clerk
Bill McCully, Quest

Vote Indiana Team Chairman Todd Rokita called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. Dee Ann Hart moved the May 30, 2003 minutes be adopted after technical changes (removing language “not complete” from the list of others present on page 1) had been made. Brad King seconded the motion, and the minutes were accepted by consensus as amended.

Chairman Rokita commented on the tremendous response received during the public comment period. Facilitator Sarah Taylor reviewed the agenda and introduced proxies.

Chairman Rokita opened the floor for public comment before members began their final deliberations of the State Plan.

Public Comment:

Joe Money, representing the National Federation of the Blind, as Legislative Chair, told the Team members of his negative voting experience in Marion County because his ballot had to be read to him. Mr. Money estimates 106,000 voters with disabilities in Indiana don't vote due to inaccessible machines and locations. He informed members that there are several election equipment companies that make accessible voting machines and, although those machines may be more expensive up front, it could save counties money in the long run on ballot costs and time counting. He expressed his desire to inform the disabled community about the Vote Indiana process, and Chairman Rokita noted that there were three representatives of that community on the Team, including one from the Governor's Planning Council for People with Disabilities.

Don Kooks, representing ACBI, wanted to encourage election administrators to seek out voting equipment for the disabled community that allowed them to cast their ballots in secret. Robert Vane replied that Marion County had received their new accessible machines with audio component and would bring them to the National Federation of the Blind Convention for demonstration.

Julia Vaughn, representing Count Us In, commented that the position of County Clerk was absent from the proposed definition of local advisory council. Mr. King replied that, although there is some variety in the role of the Clerk from county to county, it was assumed by the Team that the Clerk, or a deputy, would serve in some capacity on the council.

Chairman Rokita called attention to the issues agenda. Members decided that instead of working off of the proposed issues agenda, they would tackle the outstanding issues by section in the plan, using Pam Finlayson's draft with Mr. King and Ms. Robertson's proposed changes as a guide.

During the Team's review of each Section of the Plan, Ms. Taylor called the Team's attention to written public comments applicable to that Section. The Team then reviewed and considered those comments.

Executive Summary; Glossary of Terms and Acronyms: Mrs. Taylor suggested additional terms be added to the glossary and acronym section. Mr. King presented proposed technical amendments. The Team members accepted the amendments and the proposed language by consensus.

Section 1: Mr. King suggested adding a subsection entitled “Voting History” to reference changes in Indiana the past few years, including the budget crisis that diverted Build Indiana Funds (BIF) away from voting system reimbursement. Mr. King pointed out language in new legislation (Public Law 209-2003) that allows for counties that purchased a voting system between 1998 and 2001 to be reimbursed. He further explained that under HAVA, the restrictions on Section 101 money are the most flexible; therefore, Section 101 would be the only federal fund available to reimburse counties for pre-2000 purchases. Ms. Finlayson commented that this was a practical issue due to the budget set forth in the plan. Brad added that \$2 million was set aside for voting equipment under Section 101 funds. Chairman Rokita noted that at the Clerk’s conference, clerks expressed confusion about the original BIF money that was diverted and the current reimbursement money. Rokita suggested the Team discuss the issue (of reimbursing counties for pre-2000 reimbursements from Section 101) during the budget discussion, which is set forth in Section 6.

Ms. Robertson began the discussion on first-time mail-in registrants. She suggested the Team take the more cautious approach (narrow approach) to defining mail-in registrants (only those received through the mail), with the knowledge that they may need to broaden the definition once the Federal Election Assistance Commission makes a ruling. She informed the Team that, in an effort to be pro-active on this issue, the IED has already sent out a memo and sample notice to the counties for first time mail-in voter registration applications. Ms. Cummings, representing the IVRA, questioned if the law required all the language in the sample notice. Mr. King explained that although variations in the wording of the notices were permissible, the notice must inform the voter of the i.d. requirement and encourage that a photocopy of the i.d. be submitted prior to the election. Ms. Herzog pointed out that she had emailed a simplified notice to the Election Division.

Zach Main said he was not convinced the Team’s consensus was to take the narrow approach. Mr. Winston said that many counties conduct voter registration drives and he favored the proposed language leaning toward the narrow approach and not creating more impediments to vote. Ms. Robertson replied that this was an issue other states were also struggling with, but most had decided to take the more narrow approach due to the fear that if they took the broad approach there was a possibility to find out later that they had disenfranchised voters. Ms. Cummings said that the intent seemed to be to provide i.d. Mr. Winston asked if the i.d. requirement disappears when the statewide voter registration system is operational. Mr. King answered that the requirement goes away in part, but still remains in effect if an individual is the first-time registrant in the state.

Mr. Rhoad noted that transportation for the disabilities community is an issue and presenting oneself in person would not be convenient. Pam made a point of clarification that no copy is made of an i.d. if the registrant comes in person to the voter registration office. Further discussion ensued, and Chairman Rokita made the point that it was not in the scope of the Team’s mission to interpret law. He also said that resolution of this issue is not necessary for certification for federal funds. He suggested adopting the narrow approach but being prepared to take the broader approach if adopted by the federal government. Ms. Barretto commented that we should be leaders in removing barriers not adding any to the voter registration process. Mr. Main made a motion to strike the proposed language (explaining individual team member’s opinion to take a narrow or broad approach) from the plan and Representative Richardson seconded. It was confirmed that the plan remained HAVA compliant by striking the language. The motion passed by consensus. Mr. King presented proposed additional technical amendments. The Team members accepted the amendments and the proposed language in Section 1 by consensus.

Section 2: There were no changes to the plan in Section 2. Team members accepted the language in the plan by consensus.

Section 3: Mrs. Taylor noted that during the public comment period, an anonymous note was left in the Indiana State Board of Accounts question/comment box during the annual clerks' conference sitting a need for the team to give informative sessions to other local government officials impacted by HAVA. Mr. King suggested that the Team give Mrs. Taylor permission to draft language to that effect and the Team agreed. Mr. King presented proposed additional technical amendments. The Team members accepted the amendments and the proposed language in Section 3 by consensus.

Section 4: Mr. King presented proposed additional technical amendments. The Team members accepted the amendments and the proposed language in Section 4 by consensus.

Section 5: Mr. King presented proposed additional technical amendments. The Team members accepted the amendments and the proposed language in Section 5 by consensus.

Section 6: Mr. King reviewed the revised figures and charts. The Team returned to the Section 101 money discussion they began under Section 1 of the plan. The issue was whether to reimburse counties for voting system purchases made prior to November 2000 (SEA 268 specifies January 1998 through July 2001). Ms. Padish commented on behalf of another clerk in the audience that counties that have already purchased machines are running in a deficit and the Tier B counties would like to see more money given to them. Ms. Finlayson expressed the likelihood that Tier A counties, by necessity, would use up all of the Section 101 money. She further pointed out that HAVA only relates to post November 2000 purchases. Mr. Dodge asked how counties in a lease agreement would be reimbursed. Ms. Robertson said that Vigo County had specified (in their application) the full amount that they owed even though payments were made on a yearly basis.

Mr. King explained the proposed "first come, first served" application processes for the Team to choose between. The first process (longer process) considered the date of filing prior applications (filed by January 31, 2003) for reimbursement from the Build Indiana Fund. The second process was a strict first come first served approach considering only the date amended applications or first time applications were filed (from those counties that did not file before January 31, 2003). The election administrators on the Team liked the second, more direct approach. Ms. Hart liked the longer approach. Ms. Finlayson wants a simple process to explain to her county council. She wants a new process recognizing that the process has new rules. Ms. Jackson-Boner asked about the administrative time frame for both approaches as it related to time and resources for the IED. Ms. Robertson and Mr. King said that either approach could be administered and neither one was more burdensome. Ms. Finlayson asked what the advantage was to counties. Mr. Kiefer said that those who acted early (by submitting application before January 31, 2003) should be rewarded and therefore, the longer process should be used. Chairman Rokita asked Ms. Hibbard what the position of the Association of Indiana Circuit Court Clerks was. Ms. Hibbard asked for clarification if the application was only for retiring punch card and lever machines. Mr. King clarified that one application would be for all types of voting equipment reimbursement, and that the "first come, first served" rule agreed to by the Team would apply to each type of reimbursement. Ms. Finlayson suggested that we keep it current with HAVA and not punish or reward for an old application. Mr. King reminded the Team that this was only about the IED/SOS processing the application and not what the Budget Committee will do. Ms. Cummings warned of long lines to file applications if the simpler approach was used. Mr. King said that there is a practical issue, which is that the council

will have to be consulted so not everyone could file an application tomorrow. Ms. Richardson agreed, reminding the team that this was for reimbursement and that machines would have to be purchased first. Ms. Herzog said that the first application was for money that was diverted and suggested starting fresh because that money is no longer available. Chairman Rokita asked what the long process would do to those 72 counties that already filed applications and does it create additional confusion for those counties. Ms. Richardson said that the only help would be for the counties to know what their rank was. Ms. Robertson said the rank would depend on when the amended application is submitted. Ms. Finlayson said that she does not want to add a confusing and complicated process, but would prefer something straightforward that she can understand, which in her opinion is the shorter process. Chairman Rokita asked what the fallout was of telling clerks that their earlier application was not being considered. Ruth Hibbard, on behalf of the Clerk's Association, pointed out that since there was no money to reimburse the expenses laid out in the earlier applications, it was a "moot point" and the clerks would appreciate a fresh start. Chairman Rokita asked Mr. Dodge what he thought. Mr. Dodge thought that some consideration to the earlier application seemed fair. He also liked the incentive to get the application in under the lengthy process. Mr. King suggested that the reward for the counties that already submitted the original application was that a portion of the work was already done. Laura Herzog made a motion to go with the simpler process, effectively striking the longer process from the draft. Mr. Kiefer suggested going with the simple process since the clerks on the Team favored that approach. Chairman Rokita asked again what the Clerks' Association would prefer. Ms. Hibbard said the clerks would better understand the shorter, simpler approach. Mr. Dodge said he, on behalf of the Association of Indiana Counties, preferred the lengthy approach but was probably out voted. There was consensus to accept the shorter version. (First come, first served determined upon date and time that an amended application or first time application is filed with the Election Division)

Following a short break to eat lunch, Dick Dodge, representing the Association of Indiana Counties (AIC), stated that the AIC would be in favor of the more detailed (the lengthy) process, and motioned to reconsider the previous vote. That motion, taken by hand vote, failed 7-12. Two members abstained from voting.

Ms. Richardson asked if the Budget Committee would have some control over the application process. Ms. Robertson said yes and that they meet monthly.

Mr. King explained the application process for the distribution of Section 102 funds. Mr. Winston inquired if there was any liability to the state if it acknowledged that a polling place was inaccessible. Mr. King replied that it was quite common for the IED to be named a co-defendant in litigation to enforce election laws, but that it was the responsibility of the counties to assign polling locations. Mr. Vane noted that every county has at least one completely accessible site if they have designated a special precinct according to I.C. 3-11-8-6, and Ms. Robertson countered that HAVA requires all polling sites to be accessible after 2005. Ms. Jackson-Boner informed the Team that she envisions surveys being conducted in "real time" on election day. Ideally, the surveys would be done during the 2004 Primary so that problems identified could be fixed for the 2004 General Election. Mr. King noted that the county could apply for an extension until March 2006 for the individual polling sites that are still not up to code. Ms. Hart recommended that every polling place should strive to be accessible.

Mr. King continued discussing the application process until Nick Rhoads inquired if a county that has met all of their election obligations could retain the funds instead of returning them. Mr. King

said that, although it had not been addressed at this point in the plan, a county would have to use the money for some election expenditure. Mr. Winston asked if voting system vendors charged interest while counties are awaiting reimbursement. Mr. Winston then recommended that the Election Division and SOS use their leverage to strongly encourage that vendors do not charge interest while counties await reimbursement. Ms. Robertson suggested inserting that in the QPA. Chairman Rokita recommended that vendors only enter into the QPA if they agree not to charge interest while counties await reimbursement. The Team accepted by consensus.

Team members discussed the maintenance of effort requirements imposed by HAVA. Mr. King explained that the proposed language to amend the plan required the counties to maintain the expenditures of the average of the county's 2000, 2001 and 2002 fiscal years, excluding voting system purchases. Mr. Winston asked if a county created efficiency, if they still had to spend the same amount (as the average of the 2000, 2001 and 2002 fiscal years). Mr. King said that one concern expressed in the subgroups was that a county may be tempted to take the federal HAVA dollars and give \$0 to election administration because there is no requirement in HAVA that local government maintain their expenditures on election administration. The only requirement under federal HAVA is that the "state" maintain their election expenditures. He added that this was a policy reason to require counties to have MOE. He also said that the efficiency issue is the counter argument against a MOE for counties. Chairman Rokita asked if a county zeroed out its election budget if the state would be in jeopardy of paying back federal funds. Mr. King answered no.

The Team then discussed how reimbursement money could be spent. Chairman Rokita asked if under federal law, a county that had already replaced punch card and lever voting systems in 2001, could only spend money on election expenses. Mr. King said that was the effect of one of the proposed provisions of the plan. Chairman Rokita asked if that was the effect of law. Mr. King and Ms. Robertson both said no, it was more of a policy issue and it is open to interpretation. Mr. King added that money not spent on election expenses may be subject to recoupment under a federal audit. Chairman Rokita indicated that he wanted this issue decided in favor of the county's discretion. Mr. Main suggested a compromise – a county could provide proof upfront of where the funds originally came from to pay for a voting system. This document would be kept as a record for federal audit. This could provide an incentive to use the money efficiently. The election administrators on the Team expressed a concern that other portions of the clerk's budget could suffer because the county legislative body would want to recoup their initial capital expenditures on a voting system. Ms. Hibbard informed the team of a similar issue with the state child support computer system, ISETS. The federal government came in and made counties give back money that was not spent on the ISETS program. Therefore, the Team decided that idea of having the county certify how the money was spent up front would not solve the problem. Mr. Dodge also noted that counties need to have a specific line item in the budget or money may revert to the general fund.

The Team returned to the maintenance of effort question (whether a county was required to maintain their election budgets). Ms. Robertson said that HAVA only requires an MOE at the state level, not county level. Chairman Rokita called for a vote whether to strike provision #12 (regarding county MOE). The motion passed 11-8 to strike.

The Team returned to the discussion of using Section 101 funds for pre-2000 voting systems purchase reimbursement. Ms. Cummings asked what the funds would be used for other than pre-2000 reimbursement. Mr. King referred back to the budget and explained that the intent of Section 101 funds was to improve elections. Ms. Robertson noted that according to state law,

reimbursements could go back as far as 1998. Chairman Rokita said that the plan currently called for 69% of the HAVA funds to go for voting system reimbursement and that it would be irresponsible to spend more on voting systems when we have other obligations to do like training and education and the statewide voter registration system. Chairman Rokita then emphasized that it did not matter to him how that 69% was spent with regard to voting systems and that the local government representatives on the Team should decide how to best allocate it. Ms. Finlayson asked how comfortable the team was with the estimate for the statewide voter file. Ms. Robertson said she is pretty comfortable that our estimate is comparable with other states. Mr. King pointed out that within a short period of time, we will know more about the contract and the amount of money. Ms. Hibbard stressed to the Team how important it was for all of them to lobby for full funding from Congress. Ruth said she would ask all clerks to talk with their congressman. Representative Richardson suggested the Team hold off on making a decision (on Section 101 funds) until we know how much money the state would receive. Chairman Rokita said that reimbursing pre 2000 purchases was a question in public comment that he is trying to get resolved, and he wanted the Team to respond to it. Mr. King suggested that we don't disburse any Section 101 funds until we know more. Ms. Finlayson added that education and accessibility should not fall short.

Mr. Vane inquired about voter outreach and suggested counties negotiate with their vendors to add development of materials into their contract. Chairman Rokita replied that the plan already provides funding for voter outreach at \$1.4 million; however, a "shared materials" clause could be added to the QPA. The Team agreed by consensus to add the shared materials clause to the QPA, but did not agree that a provision for voter education amount should be mandatory in their contracts with counties. Chairman Rokita called for a vote on proposed language that calls for Section 101 funds to be used for reimbursement for pre-November 2000 voting system purchases but only after all other funds are exhausted and HAVA obligations are met. The motion to include this language passed 11-6. Mike Kiefer stated that he did not agree with spending HAVA funds on pre-November 2000 expenditures. Ms. Finlayson concurred. Ms. Hart said that she did not foresee us getting to that point.

Ms. Robertson explained the subsection on new precincts, saying that it would allow for the fluctuation in the number of precincts. Tami Barreto moved to strike the "maintenance of effort" clause under the "state and federal auditing" section. The Team agreed. Ms. Jackson-Boner inquired whether the Governor's Planning Council would have to staff the local advisory councils, and Mr. King clarified that, no, the local planning councils would just need to partner with the GPCPD.

Ms. Jackson-Boner said she liked the supplemental application provisions. Chairman Rokita asked if supplemental applications or pre-2000 reimbursements are considered first. Ms. Robertson suggested supplemental should be first. The Team agreed.

Ms. Robertson led a discussion about what expenses were eligible for reimbursement, informing members that the IED would be reviewing applications to see if expenses were reasonable. Team members agreed to change the words "would be" to "may be" eligible.

When the discussion turned to the Statewide Voter Registration system, Mr. Main and Ms. Finlayson suggested the Team was being too specific in the plan, and could perhaps be limiting themselves, considering they had not even chosen a system yet. Chairman Rokita countered that the clerks wanted to know what they would be responsible for during public comment at the clerk's

conference. Ms. Finlayson said because every county is unique, she does not know how we can provide those answers at this point. Mr. Main added that we don't even know what hardware is going to be necessary. Ms. Finlayson asked what counties had to do right now. Chairman Rokita then deferred to Ms. Hibbard for the clerks' positions. Ms. Hibbard said that it would be great if the State were responsible for hardware and software, but the clerks know that is not reasonable. She indicated that for start up that is true, but like everything else in the clerk's office, the clerks take over and take care of it. "We want you to tell us so that we know who will be responsible," added Ms. Hibbard. Mr. King said that we will know much more in a year and this is not a budgetary concern for the counties this year. Chairman Rokita asked the Team if they wanted to decide this issue right now. Chairman Rokita said for the record that the state should be responsible for all costs associated with making the system successfully operational, and that subsequent equipment purchases might be borne by counties. Chairman Rokita noted that the Team did not want to decide the issue today and want to discuss it further in the future. Chairman Rokita stated he had called the Clerk of Montgomery County, Jeff Dossett, who made remarks during public comment at the Clerks' conference and asked he submit his public comment to be shared with the Team. Mr. Rokita indicated that he especially agreed with Mr. Dossett's approach. Sarah noted Mr. Dossett's document was in their packet for review. Members agreed that they did not want to lock themselves into anything right now, and therefore agreed to strike paragraphs under "Replacement and Upgrade" and "Upgrades before 2006."

The Team agreed to the addition of Appendix 2, which concerned the Indiana Bond Bank – Hoosier Equipment Lease Purchase (HELP) Program.

Mr. King and Ms. Robertson presented proposed additional technical amendments, which were accepted by consensus.

The Team then accepted the amended language in Section 6 by consensus.

Section 7: Mr. King and Ms. Robertson presented proposed additional technical amendments, which were accepted by consensus. The Team accepted the amended language in Section 7 by consensus.

Section 8: Ms. Jackson-Boner suggested that the following language be inserted under Grievances in the Description of the Official: the Protection and Advocacy Commission will assist with administering the grievance procedure as it relates to persons with disabilities. Mr. King and Ms. Robertson presented proposed additional technical amendments, which were accepted by consensus. Team members accepted the addition suggested by Ms. Jackson-Boner and the language in Section 8 of the plan by consensus.

Section 9: The Team members accepted the language in the plan by consensus.

Section 10: The Team members accepted the language in the plan by consensus. Mr. King and Ms. Robertson presented proposed additional technical amendments, which were accepted by consensus. The Team accepted the amended language in Section 10 by consensus.

Section 11: The Team members accepted the language in the plan by consensus.

Section 12: The Team members accepted the language in the plan by consensus.

Section 13: The Team members accepted the language in the plan and additional language suggested by Sarah to include that meetings were held in accordance with Indiana's Open Door Law and additional parties received word of the Preliminary State Plan and the public comment by consensus. Mr. King and Ms. Robertson presented proposed additional technical amendments, which were accepted by consensus. The Team accepted the amended language in Section 13 by consensus.

Items for Future Consideration:

Colonel Ryan moved that the IED consider future participation in the Department of Defense's internet voting project. He thought this would be advantageous for military voters. The Team agreed to add it to the Items for Future Consideration list.

Ms. Robertson reported that although the issues covered in Tom Gallagher's (Protection and Advocacy Commission) memo were helpful, not all of them needed to be incorporated into the plan.

Chairman Rokita questioned in response to public comment whether a ballot security component should be placed in the plan. Pam responded that there shouldn't be a problem if poll workers are sufficiently trained. Mr. King added that there is specific curriculum for ballot security in each county.

Mr. Main presented the Team members with a proposal for Items for Future Consideration that would call for every voter to present identification at the polls. Mr. Vane said Marion County was in agreement. Ms. Hart expressed concern over the cost of identification cards. Ms. Robertson (who was now serving as proxy for Mr. Winston and Mr. Laramore) opposed any such language as it was out of the scope of the Team's purpose. Ms. Hibbard said she doesn't care herself but recalls voters complaining to her that they won't vote again if asked for i.d. at the polls. Ms. Barreto said the League of Women Voters was opposed to adding anything not required by HAVA including the i.d. requirement (beyond the first-time mail-in registrant requirement) at the polls. Ms. Cummings, having seen fraudulent behavior first hand administering elections in Marion County, said she would feel more secure about the integrity of the process if all voters showed identification. Ms. Finlayson remarked that a voter registration system that worked well would help solve many of the problems. Mr. Dodge maintained that only first-time mail-in voters should show i.d., but Mr. Main countered that there was ambiguity on who that applied to. Col. Ryan suggested a motion for an impact study to be done on the issue by the General Assembly. Ms. Robertson said that she was not in favor of further study of this issue. Ms. Cummings said that the legislative process is in and of itself a study. Mr. Main called for a motion to add language to the Items for Future Consideration that would indicate the majority of the Vote Indiana Team members wanted the Indiana General Assembly to consider the issue of identification at the polls during their next session. Ms. Robertson called for a roll call vote. The motion to take the vote by roll call passed 15-2. Mr. Main's motion failed 9-11 with 1 abstention. Members voting yes were: Cummings, Main, Rhoads, Adkins, Ryan, Vane, King, Rokita, and Nidlinger. Members voting no were: Winston, Laramore, Robertson, Hart, Barreto, Padish, Hibbard, Kiefer, Dodge, Jackson-Boner, and Finlayson. Member abstaining was: Wilson.

Ms. Robertson asked that Mr. Winston's proposed language be included in public comment. Mr. Winston's proposed language stated that the plan contain language stating that nowhere in the plan is the Team suggesting that identification cards be shown at polling sites for all voters.

The Team accepted the amended language presented by Mr. King and Ms. Robertson in “Items for Future Consideration” and Appendix A by consensus.

Chairman Rokita asked for a general consensus to send the plan, with changes, to the Federal Government, and the Team members agreed unanimously by voice vote. Chairman Rokita thanked the Team and stated that he thought Indiana had one of the best plans out there. Chairman Rokita also thanked Brad and Kristi for the proposed language document and thanked the facilitators for their hard work.

Chairman Rokita adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.